

INTEGRATING AUTHORITY AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT: WEST VANCOUVER'S WORKING GROUP MODEL

by

Pamela Goldsmith-Jones
Bachelor of Arts, University of British Columbia, 1986
Master of Arts, University of British Columbia, 1988

PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Aboriginal Business and Leadership
of the
Faculty
of
Business Administration

© Pamela Goldsmith-Jones 2015
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Spring 2015

All rights reserved. However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for *Fair Dealing*. Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

Approval

Name: **Pamela Goldsmith-Jones**

Degree: **Master of Business Administration**

Title of Project: **Integrating Authority and Public Engagement: West Vancouver's Working Group Model**

Supervisory Committee:

Glenn Sigurdson
Adjunct Professor
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University

Mark Selman
Director, EMBA in Aboriginal Business and Leadership
Beedie School of Business
Simon Fraser University

Date Approved: **April 8th 2015**

Abstract

This study is an example of integrated governance demonstrated by the Rodgers Creek Area Plan working group. The Rodgers Creek working group transformed public policy making from adversarial to consensual. It represents the intersection of local government authority and public participation, through consensus building. Parties with diverse views dealt with their differences and made a series of good decisions. Those most affected became the architects of the recommendations. The study concludes with questions about how the working group model could be applied to First Nations land development in an urban setting.

The author of this study was the mayor of West Vancouver during the time the Rodgers Creek working group was formed and made its recommendations.

Dedication

For John Brodie.

Acknowledgements

The members of the Rodgers Creek working group, supported by municipal staff, were leaders in drawing together council's authority, private property owners' interests and citizen engagement. The working group led a consensus building process, ensuring that future generations would not be compromised by decisions taken today, in the Upper Lands of West Vancouver.

I would like to acknowledge Danny Shapiro, Mark Selman and Ulrike Radermacher for pioneering the Executive MBA in Aboriginal Business and Leadership, and Glenn Sigurdson for his experience, guidance and good humour.

And finally, thank you to our class – it is like no other, and it was a privilege to learn side by side and to make new friends.

Table of Contents

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
2: BACKGROUND TO THE CHALLENGE OF RODGERS CREEK	5
2.1 The shared development history of West Vancouver and British Pacific Properties.....	5
3: POLICY CONTEXT	7
3.1 Golf course proposal 1990	7
3.2 Upper Lands Study Report 2001 and the Official Community Plan 2004.....	7
3.3 Community unrest: The battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs 2004	8
3.4 Convergence between West Vancouver council and the public.....	9
4: SUSTAINABLE DESIGN	11
4.1 The lay of the land.....	11
4.2 British Pacific Properties' presents envisioning notebook 2005	11
4.3 Rodgers Creek area plan working group 2006	12
4.4 Analysis of building consensus through the guiding principles	13
Principle 1. Purpose driven	13
Principle 2. Inclusive.....	14
Principle 3. Voluntary	15
Principle 4. Self-designed	15
Principle 5. Flexible	16
Principle 6. Equal opportunity.....	17
Principle 7. Respectful of diverse interests	19
Principle 8. Accountable	20
Principle 9. Time limited.....	22
Principle 10. Able to be implemented	22
5: HONOURING THE PAST AND MOVING FORWARD.....	24
5.1 Honouring the official community plan	24
5.2 Anchoring change: the mountain path.....	25
5.3 Delicate discussions: Chippendale connector road	26
5.4 Going out on a limb: Increasing allowable density for BPP	26
5.5 A world of possibility.....	27

6: THE LEGACY OF EAGLERIDGE BLUFFS	29
6.1 Parks Master Plan working group 2011	29
6.2 Upper Lands Study Review working group 2014	29
6.3 Leadership is everywhere	30
7: LOOKING AHEAD.....	33
7.1 Squamish Nation urban land development.....	33
7.2 Beyond jurisdictional rights	35
8: THE SHARED PATH.....	37
Appendices	38
Appendix A:	
Rodgers Creek Area. Photograph taken from Jericho Point. 2008.....	39
Appendix B:	
District of West Vancouver Working Group Guidelines: Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group	40
Appendix C:	
Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report Acknowledgements, 62.....	43
Appendix D:	
Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Technical Reports.....	44
Appendix E:	
Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report, March 7. 2008, 4.....	45
Appendix F:	
Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report, March 7 2008, District of West Vancouver, p 10.	46
Appendix G:	
West Vancouver Streamkeepers' Society principles.....	47
Appendix H:	
Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report, March 7 2008, 12-13.	49
Appendix I:	
Report to the Council of the District of West Vancouver, March 11, 2008.	52
Appendix J:	
Whyte Lake, in Whyte Lake Park	53
Appendix K:	
Complete list of working groups 2006 – 2015	54
Bibliography.....	55

1: INTRODUCTION

West Vancouver was incorporated in 1912. For most people, West Vancouver is probably best known for its spectacular geographic setting, its public parks and beaches, and its expensive homes. The mountains and thirty kilometre shoreline, punctuated by the Point Atkinson Lighthouse¹ in Lighthouse Park², is Vancouver's view to the north across Burrard Inlet. The Lions Gate Bridge³ connects Vancouver to West Vancouver. West Vancouver is a residential community, with no heavy industry. Within West Vancouver, the Trans Canada highway divides the municipality in two. Below the highway to the south is where neighbourhoods began, grouped around the four small-scale commercial villages of Ambleside, Dundarave, Caulfeild and Horseshoe Bay. The land above the highway is referred to as the British Properties, where British Pacific Properties (BPP) owns 4000 acres of land, and has been developing and selling homes since the 1930's. The municipality refers to the area above the highway as the Upper Lands – because the land above the highway is not only owned by BPP but also by some smaller private landowners, the District of West Vancouver and the provincial government. Generally speaking, life in West Vancouver is peaceful. People value their privacy and are committed to excellence in all aspects of the public realm.

In December 2005 a new mayor and council were elected in West Vancouver. At the time, an uncharacteristically explosive dispute was in full swing between the municipality and the provincial government over the destruction of Eagleridge Bluffs, to make way for improving the Sea to Sky highway to Whistler. The community outcry was unprecedented in West Vancouver. Peaceful protest turned into civil disobedience and then arrests. Development, whether for roads, bridges, homes, schools or recreational amenities was nothing new in the Upper Lands. However, the battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs brought the community's deep respect for nature to the fore. In light of further expansion of the highway, and unknown future development plans by BPP, the new council needed to find a way to change gears from the politics of protest, exclusion and exhaustion toward a more productive and positive public process. Council needed to figure

¹ The Point Atkinson Lighthouse was designated a National Historic Site in 1975.

² Lighthouse Park is a 185 acre rainforest park on the West Vancouver waterfront where the waters of Howe Sound meet Burrard Inlet.

³ The Lions Gate Bridge was designated a National Historic Site in 2004.

out how to turn differences into strengths. In January 2006 council supported a report that proposed changes to municipal processes, including reconsideration of the efficacy of advisory committees. In July 2006 council adopted the working group model, to replace its advisory committee structure.⁴

Advisory committees to council had provided excellent advice over the years, but they were not designed to be conduits for public opinion, to manage uncertainty, to bring people together, or to incorporate the views of interest groups. Advisory committees operated with the same rules as council. As such, the advisory planning committee, when dealing with a sensitive land matter, was entirely within its rights to hold a portion of its meetings in-camera, without public scrutiny or input. Over time this bred mistrust in the community, not of the individuals on the committee, but of the institution itself. Views of the general public were provided through established vehicles such as town hall meetings, public input at council meetings and public input at formal public hearings. Both advisory committees and public comment opportunities were one-way channels, with input directed toward council, for council's consideration. The process tended to narrow rather than expand the range of possible solutions. The advisory committee process did not provide a way for the general public or interest groups to be on an equal footing with advisory council members. This severely limited the public's ability to participate in creating the right questions for discussion, as well as to shape the discussion so that outcomes reflected the community's capacity to deal with its inherent differences and its hopes and dreams, in a constructive manner.

In the words of the mayor at the time, "we wanted to reinvigorate citizen engagement and bring a fresh approach to working out our key public policy questions."⁵ A major departure from established practice, working groups were intended to transform public consultation into public consensus building, in order to find common ground where it had been difficult to do so in the past. Council understood that its authority structure and the demand for participation by the general public – which was evident in the extreme during the battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs – should include discussion and problem solving.

Council used its authority to create a process where the best information and expertise, as well as good will in the community, could be brought to bear in a problem-solving atmosphere, led by members of the general public. In so doing, the intent was to shift the culture of local

⁴ District of West Vancouver council reports: "Proposed changes to district processes," Jan 16, 2006 and "Council advisory committees," July 5, 2006. File 0005-01.

⁵ *Rodgers Creek: A history and summary of the area development plan*, British Pacific Properties Ltd., 2009, 4.

government decision making from adversarial to collaborative. In order to remove the perception that working groups could be subject to political interference or the perception of political interference, council appointed the Community Engagement Committee⁶ to make appointments and draft the terms of reference for all working groups. Council provided staff resources to working groups to ensure that professional advice was being given, and as a measure of its commitment to the process.

Council understood that it could not hope to change the adversarial nature of its future dealings with the provincial government, BPP, interest groups in the community or the general public without changing its own internal processes. Council took ownership of the fact that an adversarial system kept producing winners and losers. By replacing its traditional role as receiver and arbiter of advice and public opinion to one of supporting a working group to look at problems from all sides with all interested parties, council demonstrated its understanding that “leadership exists only in relationships and in the perception of engaged parties.”⁷ Council invested its political capital in the working group model, in the belief that leadership in the community exists everywhere. In this way, council shared its authority with the community, began to build a culture of collaboration and signalled that it was willing to be proactive in dealing with differences.

The working group governance process integrated those with the authority to make decisions (council) with those most impacted by council’s decisions (interest groups and the general public). This is a story of the leadership role that citizens can play, when local government marries its traditional authority structure with the ever-expanding capacity of the general public to deal with differences and contribute to decision-making. The Rodgers Creek working group⁸ was born of necessity. No one involved could have predicted that, a decade later, recommendations for the Rodgers Creek area would guide policy for West Vancouver’s Upper Lands as a whole. Members of the Rodgers Creek working group brought the community’s respect for nature to the fore. The working group embraced the ethic of designing with nature and breathed life into the 2001 Upper Lands Study and the 2004 Official Community Plan. Throughout the process, major and minor landowners, environmentalists and outdoor recreation

⁶The Community Engagement Committee (CEC) was appointed by council so that appointments to working groups and approval of terms of reference were made at arm’s length from council. Originally, the CEC included three members of council and three members of the general public. Working groups were to be made up of no more than 9 citizens, and one member of council. Working groups were given a problem, terms of reference that they were free to amend, a timeframe that was flexible and a budget. The working group was responsible for providing public policy recommendations to council.

⁷ Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, *Reframing organizations*, Jossey-Bass, 2008, 343.

⁸ The formal name is the Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group. In this report it will be referred to as the Rodgers Creek working group or simply, the working group.

enthusiasts took responsibility for the sustainability of the Rodgers Creek area development plan. These competing interests were nothing new, but the Rodgers Creek working group process found consensus among them.

The working group process was an experiment in integrated governance. By identifying vested interests in the planning outcomes for the Rodgers Creek area, the Rodgers Creek working group ensured that it had everyone in the room that needed to be there.⁹

⁹ Glenn Sigurdson, *Vikings on a Prairie Ocean*, Great Plains Publications, 2014, 281.

2: BACKGROUND TO THE CHALLENGE OF RODGERS CREEK

2.1 The shared development history of West Vancouver and British Pacific Properties

West Vancouver was incorporated in 1912. In 1931 the Guinness Company of London, England created British Pacific Properties Limited (BPP) to purchase 4000 acres in the Upper Lands of West Vancouver, stretching from the Capilano River to Horseshoe Bay, for \$75,000. BPP also made an additional investment of \$1 million in local infrastructure upgrades including roads, water lines, sewers, a school site and a golf course site. Not only did BPP keep West Vancouver from going into receivership during the Depression, its infrastructure program employed four out of every five people on relief in West Vancouver at the time.¹⁰

In 1933 the provincial government approved the construction of the Lions Gate Bridge, providing reliable access to undeveloped neighbourhoods and unlocking the value of BPP's land. The Lions Gate Bridge was opened in 1938 at a cost of \$5.7 million, 75% of which was paid for by BPP. Sixty years later, author Douglas Coupland would say "This is what I figure: if there is a heaven, and if heaven has a bridge to take us there, then surely that bridge is Lions Gate Bridge. And this bridge is ours."¹¹ In 1939 BPP built the Capilano Golf Course, consistently ranked one of the top five golf courses on the continent. Bob Hope described it as his second favourite course anywhere.¹² In 1950, Park Royal Shopping Centre was opened, western Canada's first shopping mall, named after a Guinness family brewery in the Park Royal district of London.¹³

The Lions Gate Bridge, Capilano Golf Course and Park Royal Shopping Centre created flagship amenities for the ongoing development of BPP's residential neighbourhoods, and set high standards for the settlement and growth of West Vancouver. BPP takes great pride in its role in shaping West Vancouver, and considers its approach to be measured and responsible both to its shareholders and the community. Its corporate culture is conservative by nature. BPP does not seek attention or wish to create controversy. Its power exists in the knowledge that its

¹⁰ Francis Mansbridge, *Cottages to Community*, West Vancouver Historical Society, 2010, 68.

¹¹ Douglas Coupland in Lillia d'Acres and Donald Luxton, *Lions Gate*, Talon Books, 1999, 9.

¹² *Cottages to Community*, 73.

¹³ *Cottages to Community*, 75.

development rights are secure. Although BPP considers itself a good corporate citizen, it is also fair to say that the public may perceive BPP as detached and entitled. BPP's history has not been one of robust public engagement.

Neighbourhoods in the British Properties are desirable places to live. Sometimes referred to as martini mountain, homes in the British Properties have evolved from emulating large British estates with expansive lawns and landscapes, to the west coast modern architecture of Ron Thom, Arthur Erickson and Fred Hollingsworth, to present day popular craftsman style and contemporary homes. Residents of the west side of Vancouver sometimes complain that their view to the north is being ruined by development, as do commuters heading home over the Lions Gate Bridge looking westward at the mountains. Some people understand and accept the trade-offs between the rights of BPP to develop their land and the policy room council has to require standards and achieve public benefits, as new neighbourhoods are built. Others expect council to exert more control over BPP, to soften the impact of development. Others assume that the undeveloped Upper Lands is parkland, and are entirely unaware of the zoning rights of BPP.

West Vancouver possesses the authority to permit development. The public, through council, grants permission for what BPP can do. Occasionally, the public has taken a particular interest in the Upper Lands, particularly when special wilderness areas are threatened. Both BPP and the general public have a sense of ownership of the Upper Lands. BPP legally owns 4000 acres, but in the sense that "ownership is much more than a legal or physical reality; it is an emotion,"¹⁴ the general public has an ownership attachment to the land as well.

¹⁴ Glenn Sigurdson, *Vikings on a Prairie Ocean*, Great Plains Publications, 2014, 287.

3: POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 Golf course proposal 1990

During the 1990 municipal election, the community galvanized around a ballot question that asked whether citizens would approve the development of a 27 hole golf course in an area of second growth and old growth forest in the Upper Lands. The council of the day felt that the community would support a golf course. On election day the golf course proposal was defeated 7800 to 5800 votes. In the subsequent 1993 municipal election, a follow up ballot question asked whether the community wished to preserve the old growth forest area where the golf course site had been proposed. 86% of those who cast ballots voted in favour of preservation. After several years of dormancy on the matter, council followed through on the ballot directive, and formed a partnership with the Old Growth Conservancy Society in 2007. Members of the conservancy represent a range of conservation and recreation interests including naturalists, mountain bikers and hikers, all of whom strive to protect the natural features and recreational assets of the mountainside.

3.2 Upper Lands Study Report 2001 and the Official Community Plan 2004

In 1995 BPP presented a proposal for the development of the area called Rodgers West.¹⁵ Council deferred the development application, choosing instead to review all policy related to land use planning in the remaining, undeveloped, Upper Lands. Council appointed the Upper Lands Task Force, which produced the 2001 Upper Lands Study Report. Key recommendations were to:

- create a strong community
- establish a sensitivity and connection to the natural environment and mountain qualities
- encourage a diverse community
- focus on environmental and economic sustainability.¹⁶

¹⁵ Although the land owned by BPP was zoned for single-family dwellings, at a gross density of 2.5 units per acre, BPP still requires development permits, building permits and other approvals in order for development to proceed. Following the adoption of the OCP in 2004, future development would be subject to council approval of Area Development Plans.

¹⁶ District of West Vancouver Official Community Plan (OCP) 2004, Policy Section 7, Upper Lands, 95.

At the same time, council was also updating West Vancouver's official community plan (OCP), which was adopted in 2004. The Upper Lands Study report became the basis of policy governing the Upper Lands in the OCP. Section 7, Upper Lands states that:

...policies are intended to ensure that West Vancouver will continue to be a community of neighbourhoods, will focus on its environmental assets and will insist on the creation of great places to live. The Future Neighbourhoods Area, representing 7% of the total land area in the District, will be primarily comprised of homes, parks and protected creeks and greenbelts. It is expected that up to 60% of the dwelling units would be single-family homes...¹⁷

The policy articulated the importance of environmental assets, within a framework of building neighbourhoods and mostly single family homes. The Upper Lands section was viewed as innovative, but it still assumed that property would be developed in an incremental fashion, parcel by parcel.

3.3 Community unrest: The battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs 2004

In 2003 Vancouver won the bid to host the 2010 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games. The provincial government immediately entered into discussions with West Vancouver to plan an upgrade to the Sea to Sky highway to facilitate access from Vancouver to Whistler. When it became apparent that the provincial government was recommending an overland route, rather than a tunnel underneath Eagleridge Bluffs, West Vancouver council voted unanimously to oppose the overland route. West Vancouver filed a lawsuit against the federal government in the spring of 2005, claiming that the government failed to provide a proper environmental assessment for the project. BPP was also opposed to the overland route, wishing to retain full control of its as yet undeveloped property.

The municipality's formal legal battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs ended in the spring of 2005, when the court found in favour of the federal government, stating that it believed that the province would conduct the harmonized environmental assessment of the highway upgrade proposal properly. The province expropriated the land it required, parcels of which were owned by West Vancouver and parcels of which were owned by BPP. However, the Coalition to Save Eagleridge Bluffs continued to protest, garnering sustained media attention and ongoing support from council. The protest culminated in a tent city that occupied the bluffs in April and May of

¹⁷ OCP, 95.

2006. In May 2006 the court ordered an injunction against the protesters, which the Eagleridge Bluffs and Wetlands Preservation Society appealed and then dropped two days later.”¹⁸

When it was perfectly clear that title to the land now belonged to the provincial government, the mayor requested that protesters abandon their tent city, and come down from the bluffs. Some protestors went home, but dozens continued to protest. The tent city continued, until the West Vancouver police arrived to arrest people.¹⁹ Later, when the provincial government made payment for the expropriated lands, both West Vancouver and BPP responded by suing the provincial government for insufficient compensation. In the end, the court awarded West Vancouver an additional \$6.27 million above the provincial government’s original offer of \$6.27 million. BPP was awarded a greater amount.

The controversy was a defining moment for West Vancouver and a shock to the system. Development of the Upper Lands had always been a local matter, between the municipality and BPP. The provincial government exploited the OCP phrase “Future Neighbourhoods Area” to discredit West Vancouver’s claim that it planned to protect Eagleridge Bluffs. For the protesters and others interested in the environmental and recreational value of Eagleridge Bluffs and the surrounding area, the phrase was an unwelcome revelation and profoundly disappointing. The OCP had tried to elevate the importance of environmental assets in the context of the Upper Lands, but the municipality was shown to be quite vulnerable. The history of residential real estate development by BPP could not be denied, and served to undermine the credibility of council when it attempted to change course.

3.4 Convergence between West Vancouver council and the public

Although the battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs divided public opinion, and tested the vision and credibility of the municipality, it also operated as a convergent force to bring the traditional, incremental, approach to land use planning together with strong public support for the overall environmental and recreational value of the Upper Lands. Council and the general public received a rude awakening during the Eagleridge Bluffs standoff, and found themselves asking:

¹⁸ Standing Up for Nature, The Anatomy of a Protest, The Coalition to Save Eagleridge Bluffs, 2014, 137. Unedited, and quoted with the permission of Barbara Pettit.

¹⁹ In January 2007, sixteen West Vancouver citizens were found guilty of contempt of court. Their sentences included payment of legal costs and paying a further fine or performing non-environmental community service hours.

1. What areas of the undeveloped mountainside would actually be future neighbourhoods?
2. What is the relationship between BPP, other private landowners and the municipality in determining how and when these future neighbourhoods are developed?
3. What publicly owned land in West Vancouver could or should be protected for outdoor recreation and environmental conservation?
4. What is the public process for creating a vision and a plan for the Upper Lands?

The public protest was a serious and protracted effort to advocate for West Vancouver's natural heritage. The OCP seemed flimsy in the face of external threats. It had not stood up to public scrutiny, nor had it served to defend publicly held beliefs, nor did the "future neighbourhoods" designation reflect the challenging topography and unique ecosystem of Eagleridge Bluffs.²⁰

The value of the remaining undeveloped property was not solely defined, in the minds of the general public, by residential real estate development. Most likely it never had been. Although the municipality had long been involved in the give and take of executing development approvals with BPP, it was unaccustomed to wide-open, sustained controversy, played out in the local and national media. Past differences between the municipality and BPP seemed minor compared to the imperative to better define, protect and act on mutually held public and private long term values and interests, together. To do this West Vancouver would have to improve the dynamic between itself and BPP, and between both entities and the public.

The destruction of Eagleridge Bluffs sparked a fledgling vision for a more holistic and environmentally conscious approach to the development of the Upper Lands. It cracked open the idea that the general public, both individuals and interest groups, wanted to be part of a public discussion that encompassed all of the undeveloped Upper Lands. It was quite clear that the stewards of this vision would require a public process built in the image of the problem. Only in this way could:

- those directly affected by future decisions address their concerns face to face with the authority represented by staff, council and BPP
- the OCP definition of "future neighbourhoods" be refined, so that policy would support an optimal balance between property development, environmental conservation and social sustainability
- consensus be reached by all participants and affected parties, and
- all participants be committed to the final decision.²¹

²⁰ *Standing up for nature*, 67.

²¹ Glenn Sigurdson, "Module 2: Basic concepts and context", EMBA ABL BUS 661 paraphrased from p 4.

4: SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

4.1 The lay of the land

The Rodgers Creek area encompasses two hundred and fifteen acres of land between Marr Creek and Cave Creek West, above the Upper Levels Highway and below the 1200-foot contour, accessed by Cypress Bowl Road and Chippendale Road.²² The OCP identifies Rodgers Creek as a “Future Neighbourhoods Area” to be planned for development through an area development plan. The land is undeveloped second growth forest, with:

- thirty watercourses of varying description and quality,
- difficult terrain,
- sensitive environmental resources and habitat,
- a logging past,
- a long history of recreation use for hiking, skiing and more recently, mountain biking.

The area is made up of forty-one lots and several unopened road allowances, all of which are privately owned. BPP owns all but twenty of the two hundred and fifteen acres. The other twenty acres consist of four separate five-acre parcels, each under different ownership.²³ At the time of the planning process for the Rodgers Creek area, the bulk of the property was zoned RS7 (1.5 units per acre) or RS8 (2.5 units per acre), for residential property development.²⁴

4.2 British Pacific Properties’ presents envisioning notebook 2005

As the battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs heated up and as a local election was in full swing, BPP assembled a group of experts in planning, urban design, architecture, landscape architecture, sustainable development and environmental sciences to envision possibilities for the Rodgers Creek and Cypress Village communities. This process was internal to BPP, and not a public process. The purpose of the workshop was to “provide a platform for public discussions based on sound sustainable concepts and the official community plan.”²⁵ BPP was lining up its

²² See Appendix A for visual reference of the Rodgers Creek area.

²³ OCP, 111.1.

²⁴ Rodgers Creek area development plan overview report, March 7, 2008, 1.

²⁵ Envisioning notebook: A vision for West Vancouver’s Rodgers Creek & Cypress Village Communities, British Pacific Properties, April 2006. Also see Appendix B.

development plan application, supported by its envisioning notebook, to coincide with the beginning of a new council's term of office. BPP's vision for the mountainside incorporated eight pillars of sustainability intended to achieve:

1. A complete community
2. An environmentally and community friendly transportation system
3. Green buildings
4. Multi-tasked open space
5. Green infrastructure
6. A healthy food system
7. Community facilities and programs
8. Economic prosperity

These objectives reflected a major shift for BPP, toward sustainable development. However, the envisioning notebook offered no ideas about how a process for sustainable outcomes could come into being. The timing of the envisioning notebook took the Eagleridge Bluffs battle into account by recognizing that council and the community were serious about sustainable development, but it assumed that the OCP and the existing advisory committee process of council would be able to address its development application for Rodgers Creek as though nothing about council's processes would change. BPP may have underestimated the dislocation that the Eagleridge Bluffs protest was causing and the general mood of mistrust that ensued, about future development by BPP.

4.3 Rodgers Creek area plan working group 2006²⁶

The Rodgers Creek working group was designed to seek common ground between multiple parties. The anger that resulted from the battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs provoked deeply held beliefs about the public's right to be included and to be heard. The idea that the expression of social and environmental values is integral to sound economic development was nothing new in 2005 but the authority structures that had gotten West Vancouver this far were not well suited to consensus building. An example of a successful approach to dealing with complex public policy questions was the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (NRTEE). Established in 1988 by Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, NRTEE was a non-institutional stakeholder-driven entity, designed to advise the Canadian government on ways to reconcile environmental and economic priorities. By 1991 all provinces and territories had

²⁶ The Rodgers Creek area working group was established by council motion in October 2006. See District of West Vancouver council minutes, "Council advisory committees and community engagement" Oct 16, 2006, M-6. File 0005-01/0115-01. See Appendix B for Rodgers Creek area working group guidelines.

established their own roundtables. In 1993, the network of roundtables collaborated to develop a set of guiding principles for how to build consensus.

For the roundtables, sustainability solutions were dependent upon consensus building. The roundtables engaged in a two year collaborative process to create a guide, signed by all twelve provinces and territories, as well as the NRTEE and the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. *Building Consensus for a Sustainable Future, Guiding Principles* itself is an achievement in consensus building. It lays out ten principles for how to find a way to reconcile competing interests, forge new co-operative partnerships and explore innovative solutions.²⁷ The success of the Rodgers Creek working group can be understood and measured against these guiding principles.

4.4 Analysis of building consensus through the guiding principles

Principle 1. Purpose driven

Very early in the process all parties coalesced around the idea that the landscape should inform the plan. This belief is not only a sound planning principle; it gave all interested parties common cause. Participants may have had different motivations for caring about the landscape, but they shared a commitment to offer their best ideas, in service to what the landscape could sustain.

The Rodgers Creek working group was tasked with:

...envision(ing) a future community for the Rodgers Creek area and establish(ing) detailed principles for the area development plan, taking into consideration the Upper Land principles and processes described in the Official Community Plan. Community facilities and potential land use patterns in adjacent lands may be part of the consideration.²⁸

The working group seized the opportunity to imagine the Upper Lands beyond the boundaries of the Rodgers Creek area. The terms of reference created the opportunity for long-term thinking about the entire mountainside. Municipal staff took as their guide the four key principles in the Upper Lands section of the OCP.²⁹

²⁷ *Building consensus for a sustainable future, Guiding principles*, An initiative undertaken by Round Tables on the environment and economy in Canada, 1993, 2.

²⁸ District of West Vancouver working group guidelines, Rodgers Creek area plan working group, March 3, 2007, Doc #307773v1, 1.

²⁹ See footnote 7.

Letting the landscape inform the plan, consideration of the mountain beyond the Rodgers Creek area, and the goals of the OCP provided broad scope and clear purpose to all parties. Letting the landscape inform the plan was an important breakthrough because it focused the working group quite quickly on buildable and non-buildable areas of the mountain, based on environmental assets. All parties could see that development and conservation were two sides of the same coin, and that there was only one mountain. Letting the landscape inform the plan also addressed the need to design and build roads that would respect contour lines, creeks and riparian areas. This was a marked improvement upon the level of analysis that had informed the OCP, where future neighbourhoods had been proposed in areas of high ecological value.

Principle 2. Inclusive

All parties with an interest in the issues were included in the process. Key constituencies were, and continue to be:

- The general public
- West Vancouver Streamkeepers' Society
- North Shore Mountain Biking Association
- British Pacific Properties and consultants
- Other private landowners and consultants
- Mulgrave School

Volunteers on the working group were professionals in the fields of engineering, planning, architecture, biology, communications and business. The composition of the working group gave confidence to BPP, other private landowners and council. The working group met twice a month for fourteen months. All working group meetings were held in public. The working group held two public open houses within the first six months to gather input on its evolving plan.

From the beginning, a critical decision was made to include a representative of streamkeepers on the working group, in order to embed community values that put fish first in the vision for Rodgers Creek. Streamkeepers had expressed the concern that their influence would not carry enough weight, and a solution to that was to include their representation on the working group. No private landowner was included on the working group, which caused some initial concern, and seems contrary to the notion of inclusion. However, the intent of the working group model was to give the general public all the seats at the table. The ability for the working group members to be disinterested, in the sense that they had no vested personal interest, was critical to creating a broad range of options for property development. In this way, the working group approach to inclusion broke from traditional authority structures, which promoted competition between what BPP could get and what council would permit.

Principle 3. Voluntary

No one was forced to participate in the process. However, the resources required to properly inform the plan were significant. BPP invested close to \$1 million throughout the process, to provide the technical background to West Vancouver staff and the working group. BPP and the other property owners did not have to attend meetings or provide input. They had the right not to participate. However, the open meetings hosted by the working group consistently attracted members of community groups, all private landowners and BPP's sizeable team of consultants. It was not uncommon for Council chambers, where the meetings were held, to have thirty or forty people present as observers of the presentations and discussions.³⁰

BPP's willingness to invest significant resources up front was a strong indicator of commitment to the process and elevated the quality of the final product. More importantly, the willingness to share information with all parties, in public, was a radical departure from past practice and built trust and an emotional connection to the process and its outcome. The technical group met intensely at the outset, and produced numerous reports the results of which were available to all, for their own analysis.³¹ According to the president of BPP, Jim McLean, "the process itself was a testament to the power of high ideals, sensible compromise, and an unparalleled spirit of cooperation among the groups involved."³²

Principle 4. Self-designed

Council was entirely hands off in developing the way in which the process for the Rodgers Creek plan evolved. The working group determined for itself that it would play a steering committee role, that it would take responsibility for creating a set of guiding principles to council, that it would challenge the landowners to be innovative, that it would host open houses to test the proposals and to gain broad public input, and that it would present two alternatives to council in its final report. Together, the working group, landowners, municipal staff and interested parties defined the issues and the way in which they would be tackled.

From a technical perspective, staff and consultants worked in a collaborative way in order to support working group deliberations. Patrick Lucey, a specialist in integrated water management and a consultant for BPP, put it this way:

³⁰ See Appendix C for list of those who participated on a consistent basis.

³¹ See Appendix D for list of key technical reports.

³² *Rodgers Creek: A history and summary*, 6.

I cannot stress enough how valuable it was to have District staff working together directly with the design team in the weekly technical meetings. This allowed us to avoid many of the typical misunderstandings that can often occur, and to focus completely on the more important issues involved in creating a sustainable plan for the new neighbourhoods.³³

Because the technical team reported to the working group, and not directly to council, the traditional bargaining nature of the relationship between landowners and municipal staff changed. The technical meetings addressed trade-offs that needed to be made, but they were made in the spirit of accountability to principles that the working group was developing. The way in which the Rodgers Creek working group designed its own process fostered creativity and diffused conflict.

As steward of the process, the working group was also able to avoid the distraction and sometimes destructiveness of technical discussions. It received input and was very clear that it was not the final decision making body. In this way, landowners and other interest groups were not cast in the role of petitioners to either the working group or to council. All parties with a vested interest wanted the working group to include their interests in the area development plan recommendations. Representations took the form of offerings, not lobby efforts. Participants trusted in the openness and aspirational nature of the process itself.

Principle 5. Flexible

The terms of reference enabled the scope of the solution to extend beyond the boundaries of the Rodgers Creek area, which provided the participants the opportunity to think big, with enough room to play with the ideas of concentrating density, of protecting greater expanses of forested area, and of including a wide range of opinion in order to achieve the best balance.

Respect for the four organizing principles of the OCP created a reasonable starting point that all parties could agree to. The free rein that the working group was given engendered a high degree of attachment among participants to the process and to one another. The process was able to evolve in both a logical and an organic manner, depending on what was called for. Building on the idea of letting the landscape inform the plan, consultants and municipal staff coalesced around conducting a sieve analysis of the mountainside, which took into account the environmental, recreational and topographical features of the Rodgers Creek area. This resulted in a graphic

³³ *Rodgers Creek: A history and summary*, 18.

representation of specific areas suitable for development and others that should remain in their natural state.³⁴

The sieve analysis process entailed the preparation of a series of maps showing:

- Topography, slope analysis and geotechnical conditions
- Environmental resources, watercourses and setback lines
- Watercourse assessment and proper functioning condition
- Recreation and trail resources
- Landscape and heritage resources.³⁵

The maps were then overlaid on the Rodgers Creek area in a process referred to as a sieve analysis, to reveal the interrelationships between the many aspects of the landscape, so that the development plan would fit with, not fight with, the landscape. The sieve analysis became the framework for the working group's land use policy discussion. It created confidence among working group members that the first principle in the OCP, sensitivity and connection to the natural environment and mountain qualities, was well and truly established in the area development plan recommendations. It led to a definition of and distinction between areas that could be planned for development and those that would remain in their natural state, as conservation areas. Six clearly defined geographic areas (known as Areas 1 – 6) would be suitable for development.

Principle 6. Equal opportunity

For the process to be open, fair and equitable all parties require equal access to relevant information and the opportunity to participate. The Rodgers Creek working group held its meetings in public, which was a departure from the advisory committee system. Anyone could attend, anytime. Interestingly, the initial working group guidelines allowed for the working group to meet in private. However, once the process began, the transparency and equal opportunity that came with open meetings added legitimacy to the process. The working group recognized that meeting in private was a holdover from the past, and would hurt the legitimacy of their recommendations. The meetings of the technical group were held in private, but their findings were reported publicly to the working group. In the past, recommendations for development permits for BPP had been worked out in private meetings between municipal staff and BPP, brought to council, and usually hotly debated. Council decision-making was based on staff's best advice, in the form of a council report at a formal council meeting. Public input was restricted to

³⁴ See Appendix F for sieve analysis map.

³⁵ Rodgers Creek overview report, 4. Ian McHarg pioneered the sieve analysis approach in his book *Design with Nature*.

the formality of a public hearing or a council meeting. Over time, this contributed to mistrust on the part of the public toward council and BPP.

The battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs had shown that the OCP was not sufficiently clear in its conservation goals, nor in its definition of future neighbourhoods. A critical aspect of establishing the legitimacy of future decision-making about the Upper Lands was to push the process into the open and to solicit, accept and implement public input throughout. Open governance helped to create equal opportunity, which built relationships of integrity and trust.

A public submission by the streamkeepers advocating for seven principles (May 2007) was a turning point in the process. West Vancouver streamkeepers advanced that:

- Fish and fish habitat are conserved and protected
- Watercourses are protected from change of course, piping, unnatural erosion, and other human impacts
- Stormwater systems are designed to enhance watercourses
- Watercourses remain unimpeded
- Stream health is maintained when impervious cover is minimized
- Natural, undisturbed areas (open spaces) and green connectivity belts are maximized and planned into housing complexes, and horizontal connections are treated as importantly as vertical connections.
- Native vegetation is retained,³⁶

and that this list become part of the Rodgers Creek planning principles. The working group agreed and profiled them in its public open house that same month. According to streamkeeper and working group member John Barker, “the magical thing about the final Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Document is that the seven streamkeepers’ principles are woven right in.”³⁷

The North Shore Mountain Biking Association (NSMBA) had experienced a rocky history with BPP and the municipality. Advocacy for trail and forest access for their sport had often resulted in major conflicts over property rights, ecosystem protection and other treasured recreational uses of the mountain. The NSMBA attended the May open house, and pointed out that recreational assets had not been properly recognized in the principles. As a result, cycling was also incorporated into the planning principles. The equal opportunity created by the process resulted in innovative and effective solutions that could be, and have been, implemented.

³⁶ See Appendix G for expanded version of streamkeepers’ principles.

³⁷ Telephone interview with John Barker, Rodgers Creek working group member and West Vancouver Streamkeepers’ Society member, March 7, 2015.

The Rodgers Creek working group also created a sense of equal opportunity among the landowners. The process treated all owners as equals, independent of the amount or value of property they owned or shared, or the uses to which the land was put. Equal opportunity created a climate conducive to dealing with differences.

Principle 7. Respectful of diverse interests

The flexibility and equal opportunity of the process ensured respect for diverse interests. Through the Rodgers Creek working group, the municipality was actively responding to turbulence in the community. It sought to reach outward and ensure that “who’s in the room is whoever needs to be”³⁸ as a way of helping to settle things down.

When conflicting views arose between the land use priorities of Mulgrave School, the four private landowners and BPP, the working group asked that all landowners consult amongst themselves first and present a mutually acceptable and workable solution. Inclusion of diverse opinions within the process actually began to resolve disputes. The working group was able to make recommendations to council in the knowledge that previously antagonistic groups in the community had already come to agreement.

The trust achieved by including diverse interests resulted in a comprehensive set of planning principles, including the explicit recommendations of streamkeepers and mountain bikers.³⁹ This led to three fundamentally new directions for the development of the Upper Lands:

- development be concentrated at a future Cypress Village, that would include increased housing density and commercial and recreational activities
- a mountain path be built to link neighbourhoods in the Rodgers Creek area
- the Rodgers Creek neighbourhood be linked westward to a future Cypress Village.

The mountain path would connect the overall trail system, and secure and improve the needs of all trail users including mountain bikers, cyclists, hikers and pedestrians. The village and the idea of concentrating density around the village was a significant step toward sustainability of the mountainside and departed from the historical pattern of development by BPP, which focused on one development area at a time rather than looking at the entire realm of possibility. The working group was able to deal with differences and make decisions that included the interests of all.

In a council workshop on October 2007, Rodgers Creek working group member Michael Rosen said “we are hoping that council will start thinking about instituting this new approach for

³⁸ *Vikings*, 281.

³⁹ See Appendix H for planning principles of the working group.

the village area.”⁴⁰ The reason Rosen pointed that out was because a future village, beyond the boundaries of Rodgers Creek, was integral to the goals the working group sought to achieve for Rodgers Creek. The new approach would need to be ongoing. Achieving sustainable development for the Upper Lands, with Cypress Village as the centerpiece of the built environment, would require the continuity of the working group process and the ongoing interplay of the consensus building guidelines. Rosen concluded the council workshop by saying “this has been a truly collaborative exercise.”⁴¹

Principle 8. Accountable

Parties involved in a successful consensus building process must be accountable to their constituencies as well as to the process itself. The working group was accountable to council, as seen by the fact that its recommendations were unanimously adopted, enacted into bylaws and providing direction for ongoing policy development beyond Rodgers Creek. Development is complete or underway in Areas 1 – 4 of the area development plan. Area 5, Cypress Village, is a major focus of the 2014-15 Upper Lands working group, which is expected to report out by the summer of 2015. The Rodgers Creek working group was also accountable to the public. By holding its meetings in public and by encouraging and incorporating input from multiple parties, the working group became the public interest. In a sense, its leadership was invisible. It became a trusted vehicle for the expression of the public will.

Geoff Croll was in charge of the project for BPP at the time. When asked how he had gained permission from the BPP board of directors to invest in an unproven working group process he said,

Council was pretty clear that it wanted to do things differently, and that the working group process was the way to go. The BPP board was committed to developing future neighbourhoods in a sustainable manner. It is expensive to prepare the reports needed to gain council approval and it was a good investment to do it all up front, in public and secured for a finite timeline, in this case 10 years. With regard to the working group, the calibre of the volunteers was excellent and this was key in gaining the trust of council and our board. We believed that we were being given an opportunity to participate in sustainable land development that would be supported by the community.⁴²

⁴⁰Council and Rodgers Creek area plan working group workshop, October 29, 2007. DVD recording.

⁴¹ Council and working group workshop.

⁴² Geoff Croll, President, British Pacific Properties, Personal interview, January 22, 2015.

The process engendered the confidence Croll needed, so that he could be accountable to his board.

The smaller private landowners had historically felt overshadowed by of BPP, somewhat excluded from council decision making, and subject to decisions made by forces beyond their control. Although council had not intended to marginalize other property owners, the history of BPP's land had given access, for decades, to staff and the political process at city hall. The fact that the smaller property owners were able to participate in their own right, in public, encouraged strong allegiance to the process by them and their constituencies.

Mulgrave School was present at most meetings, represented by a consultant and sometimes a board member. The school capitalized on the opportunity to put its concerns about road alignment and future school expansion opportunities on the table, which it had been trying to do for some time. The process also helped to develop trust between Mulgrave School and municipal staff and council.

It was a breakthrough for the streamkeepers' principles to be incorporated in the planning principles. Before submitting its ideas, streamkeepers consulted beyond their membership including staff from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Pacific Salmon Foundation. There was agreement from these agencies, so when the working group agreed with the principles, not only was the credibility of the plan strengthened, so was the commitment of approving authorities and respected non-profit organizations.

The broader general public was fairly quiet during the working group process. Suspicion of BPP was part of the culture among some in West Vancouver. The conflict at Eagleridge Bluffs may have served to suppress public engagement as some were tired and cynical about whether change was possible. Others had not believed in interfering with BPP's property rights in the first place. One member of council expressed concern about the increase to West Vancouver's population, and the burden on the existing tax base.⁴³ The Burgess Crawley study was available to address those concerns, which a majority of council accepted. When the working group's final recommendations came forward, including increasing density in parts of the Rodgers Creek area in order to protect over 55% of the land area, there was no objection at the public hearing. That was a first, and a dramatic departure from past history.

⁴³ Even a member of council did not seem to understand that BPP had development rights that, on average, add about 20 – 100 residents a year, regardless of what form the development were to take.

Principle 9. Time limited

The Rodgers Creek working group held its first meeting in January 2007. It met twice a month throughout the year, hosted two public open houses in June and December 2007, a public workshop with council in October 2007, and came forward with recommendations to council in March 2008. The working group maintained an ambitious schedule. Its members were professional people who took responsibility for a quality product delivered in a timely manner. BPP wanted approval for the area development plan and committed the resources to the working group process so that technical studies and supporting materials were readily available.

Municipal staff embraced the ambition and drive of the working group, and worked hard to adhere to a tight time frame. In the past, there had been no singularity of vision or purpose between the smaller private landowners, BPP and the municipality. All of the private landowners seized the working group window to advance their interests. Working group recommendations were brought forward to council in March 2008 and council gave first reading of the bylaws in July 2008, followed immediately by a public hearing, and second and third reading. In September 2008 council passed the bylaws for the Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan. Within one term of council, an original consensus process had been created in the form of working groups, the Rodgers Creek working group was constituted and made recommendations, and the area development plan became law.

Principle 10. Able to be implemented

The Rodgers Creek working group recommendations have been implemented in the eastern half of the defined area, the mountain path is roughed in and a deeper discussion of the elements of Cypress Village is underway. The plan also created a high level vision that continues to guide municipal decision-making.⁴⁴ Within the Rodgers Creek area, the sieve analysis defined six developable areas, each of which was further defined in terms of built form and density, connection to one another and integration within the landscape. The key planning principles informed the design of three neighbourhoods: Chairlift, Mulgrave and Upper and Lower East Village. The working group refined the area development plan to the point where it was an actionable document.

The working group tackled policy challenges by embracing differences of opinion, which created a more sophisticated response to development of the Upper Lands. The Rodgers Creek

⁴⁴ The Upper Lands study review working group is holding public open houses in the spring of 2015. The Cypress Village is central to the recommendations.

plan was both visionary and practical. The working group pushed the principles of sustainability far beyond what the municipality had been able to achieve before. The process legitimized critical new directions for West Vancouver in a manner that reduced controversy and made a strong case for implementation.

5: HONOURING THE PAST AND MOVING FORWARD

5.1 Honouring the official community plan

The Rodgers Creek working group recommendations begin by “commend(ing) the owners and District staff for adhering faithfully to the direction set out in the OCP.”⁴⁵ By honouring tradition, through attachment to the OCP, the working group respectfully introduced the possibility of new ideas. The working group’s allegiance to the OCP gave confidence to council, underscored accountability to existing policy, and created open minds about what was possible for the future. The role of history is critical because it is who we are. Resistance to change can be seen as an allegiance to who we are and to what’s been achieved so far. The principles for sustainability respect the value that each participant brings to the process. The Rodgers Creek working group understood the role of history as a stable force that could support change, not as an obstacle to change.

Throughout the process, the working group kept its options open, continuously incorporating new information and interests as it went along, and successfully avoiding the “great temptation and pressure to move quickly to the issues or substance of the conflict.”⁴⁶ This desire on the part of participants can limit the realm of possibility. In the Rodgers Creek example, issues emerged over time in the context of a higher purpose. Working group members sought technical information, included interest groups, took time to formulate options, and ultimately made choices that everyone could live with.⁴⁷ Overarching aspirational goals for the Upper Lands took precedence and led to both long-term ideas and specific recommendations. In this way, the working group guided West Vancouver toward a new direction for the Upper Lands as a whole.

⁴⁵ Rodgers Creek working group report to council, March 11, 2008, 9 - 10. For a complete list of recommendations see Appendix I.

⁴⁶ Gerald W. Cormick, Strategic issues in structuring multi-party public policy negotiations, in Module 3: Understanding and creating context: Establishing a framework, BUS 661, EMBA ABL, 16.

⁴⁷ For a broader discussion on new approaches to sustainability, see Glenn Sigurdson, “Consensus processes: Making decisions and resolving conflict,” 4-5.

5.2 Anchoring change: the mountain path

Four key ideas gave meaning to the working group's "strong support (for) the sustainability initiatives set out in the Overview Report,"⁴⁸ which were to:

- create the mountain path
- build Cypress Village
- plan for the expansion of Mulgrave School and change the route of the Chippendale Road extension
- and grant increased density to BPP in order to provide greater housing diversity (the latter is known as Option B).

With the exception of building the mountain path, these recommendations had been, or could continue to be, quite controversial. However, they carried authority because they had "the sanction of all concerned."⁴⁹ The Rodgers Creek working group was highly responsive to a diversity of viewpoints, without particularly considering what the political response or ramifications might be. In this way, it "liberated the participants from the fight."⁵⁰ The recommendations conveyed respect for the challenges themselves and paid attention to the hopes and dreams of interested parties. The process transformed the cynicism and chaos of the Eagleridge Bluffs controversy into a focus on consensus building, civic responsibility and short, medium and long term planning for the Upper Lands.

The mountain path represented a breakthrough idea. BPP's pattern of development in the past had been entirely car-dependent. Neighbourhoods were not connected to one another without driving from one to the other. Walking in the neighbourhood meant going up and down hills, rather than along the contour line. In keeping with the Upper Lands principles in the OCP, a public path that followed the contour line of the mountain, accessible on foot or bicycle and by those with mobility challenges, could go a long way toward addressing the creation of a strong community by linking neighbourhoods, by establishing a sensitivity and connection to the natural setting on the mountain and by providing a focus on environmental sustainability. Modeled on Whistler's Valley Trail, and building on the popularity of the West Vancouver seawalk, the mountain path served as a positive focal point and an ordering principle around which the more challenging aspects of the plan could be understood and accepted.

⁴⁸ Rodgers Creek area plan working group report to council, March 11, 2008, 10.

⁴⁹ *Vikings*, 277.

⁵⁰ *Vikings*, 260.

5.3 Delicate discussions: Chippendale connector road

The future expansion of the Mulgrave School site and the related issue of the proposed route for the Chippendale connector road created the greatest discord among participants. Mulgrave School's interest in acquiring additional property for future expansion plans, the traffic generated by the school, and the interests of small private properties put the connection to Chippendale Road at the centre of the discussion for the Area 4 lands. The working group employed maximum flexibility in entertaining these questions. Municipal staff was divided as to whether the road connection should extend to Lower Cypress Bowl Road, or to Upper Cypress Bowl Road. The lower option was cheaper to build but the upper option was recommended in the final report because it meant that public transportation routing was better, Mulgrave School's future development options were better, and the impact of the road on small private landowners was minimized or avoided altogether. According to former BPP president Jim McLean, supporting the upper option was a way for BPP to demonstrate good faith toward the other stakeholders.⁵¹

The process worked well because it placed the interests of the smaller property owners at the centre of discussion. This is a clear demonstration of the value of a consensus process. The power imbalance between BPP and the smaller landowners, and the preconceptions of senior municipal staff that favoured the lower option, were suspended in order to explore. Compared to a council meeting, the consensus process was a much better way of digging into vested interests without judgement. The working group was dispassionate regarding vested interests, and passionate about the process. As a result, interested parties themselves were also better able to set their interests aside, and to entertain a broader range of ideas. Solutions came to the fore.

5.4 Going out on a limb: Increasing allowable density for BPP

A third key direction was the recommendation to increase BPP's allowable density. Historically, BPP could build 1.5 or 2.5 units per acre on its land holdings. Even though the working group planning principles ensured that buildings were designed to fit with the topography, the unit sizes remained quite large which meant that prices would also stay at the highest end of the market. The working group called the status quo option, Option A. It also developed Option B, which provided the same massing on the same site, but with more dwelling units per acre thus promoting higher density, better affordability of units and a justification for the

⁵¹ Jim McLean, (retired) President British Pacific Properties, Personal interview, February 20, 2015.

provision of greater public amenities. This was a significant departure from past practice, and risked the appearance of disproportionately rewarding the corporate interests of BPP because it would have more dwelling units to sell. However, the working group adhered to its sustainability principles, including allowing additional accessory buildings not included in the overall increased unit count, and recommended Option B to council. This bold move reconciled the competing values of maximizing return for BPP, providing a greater range of housing choice and maximizing protection of the environment for recreational users and conservationists. Almost certainly, had BPP been the advocate of additional density above its allowable limit, staff or council would have flatly refused. When the working group proposed additional density, it was a reflection of a process that BPP had had no undue influence over. This was a breakthrough recommendation because it set the stage for managing the remainder of the Upper Lands.

5.5 A world of possibility

From the outset, the working group was encouraged to consider facilities and potential land use patterns in adjacent lands. The mountain path and the development of Cypress Village were both outside of the Rodgers Creek area, and became foundational building blocks for the future of the Upper Lands. By stepping away from an incremental approach to development, the consensus process enabled a much bigger vision. The mountain path connects the Rodgers Creek neighbourhoods to one another and ties into smaller nature trails, public open space and new neighbourhood parks. It also extends westward toward a new village. The mountain path will serve to strengthen social cohesion and a connection to nature. The Rodgers Creek plan set aside

over 55% of the total Rodgers Creek area...as environmentally protected green space including creek and riparian corridors, rock bluffs, steep terrain, stands of mature trees and other significant natural landscape formations.⁵²

This is new language for BPP, and rebalances land use in BPP's new and future neighbourhoods. The plan for Rodgers Creek describes, at its core, the values expressed by the coalition to save Eagleridge Bluffs, which is to consider and defend the natural capital of the community before making development decisions. The Rodgers Creek plan legislated a new vision for the future while respecting and improving upon the development rights of private property owners. According to the overview plan, the estimated direct and indirect economic

⁵² Rodgers Creek area development plan overview, 60.

value of the Rodgers Creek area development in 2008 dollars was \$1 billion.⁵³ For the municipality, by adding an additional 200 units to the density equation (Option B), the municipality stood to gain an addition \$2.6 million in development cost charges, and an annual additional revenue of \$320,000 above what Option A would have provided.⁵⁴ Environmental protection of 55% of the Rodgers Creek improved the business opportunity.

⁵³ This is an estimate of the total direct and indirect investment in the regional economy, through construction jobs, investment opportunities and development related goods and services. Rodgers Creek area development plan overview, 61.

⁵⁴ Property tax revenue from development in the Rodgers Creek area under Option B was \$1.4 million annually, in \$2008. Rodgers Creek fiscal impact report, April 2008, Sussex Consultants Ltd, 3-4.

6: THE LEGACY OF EAGLERIDGE BLUFFS

6.1 Parks Master Plan working group 2011

In July 2010, the Parks Master Plan Working Group (the Parks working group) was formed to provide a vision for all parks throughout West Vancouver. Public policy dated from 1977, and the Eagleridge Bluffs debate had elevated the desire on the part of many in the community to preserve wild spaces in West Vancouver, particularly in the Upper Lands. The Parks working group delivered its plan to council for adoption in July 2012. The first line of the vision statement focuses on “increase(ing) enjoyment of and pride in our natural spaces, and protect(ing), restor(ing) and defend(ing) the unique shores, parks and mountain lands of our community”.⁵⁵ Item 2.2.3 recommends that council “identify the lands surrounding Whyte Lake and Whyte Lake Trail, and protect this area as a park with a park dedication bylaw.”⁵⁶ Whyte Lake was often the destination for hikers heading up from Eagleridge Bluffs. Further on in the plan, the dedication of Whyte Lake Park is rated as a high priority and achievable in the short term.

Whyte Lake Park was protected in perpetuity in the Upper Lands in July 2014. Ten years after the battle to save Eagleridge Bluffs, the fourth council and the third mayor since the fight began fulfilled the vision to protect sensitive and much loved public land as park and wilderness, extending from where the bluffs had been, and including Whyte Lake. Whyte Lake Park is almost twice the size of Lighthouse Park. The Rodgers Creek working group, through its understanding and adoption of the sieve analysis and streamkeepers’ values, put the natural capital of the Upper Lands first. In so doing, a world of possibility opened up, and subsequent working groups and councils pushed ahead, achieving what had at one time seemed impossible. The Rodgers Creek working group sought common ground, came up with expansive ideas and implemented them.

6.2 Upper Lands Study Review working group 2014

In 2011 Metro Vancouver adopted a new regional growth strategy including growth projections and land use goals for its member municipalities. At this point, the Rodgers Creek

⁵⁵ District of West Vancouver Parks Master Plan, July 2012, (i).

⁵⁶ Parks Master Plan, 11.

area development plan had been adopted, but no further work had been undertaken for the Upper Lands as a whole. In spite of the Rodgers Creek plan, a watchdog group from outside of West Vancouver raised the spectre of urban sprawl in the media, suggesting that West Vancouver was going to build apartment towers across the Upper Lands. In the community and among other municipal councils, West Vancouver's credibility was significantly enhanced because of the Rodgers Creek plan, and its allegiance to compact development and respect for natural systems. Council responded to Metro Vancouver, and to media speculation, by requesting that the Upper Lands be designated a special study area, with two years to submit a regional context statement. The request was granted, and the Parks working group, and subsequent Upper Lands working group were formed to help answer the question. Working groups had now evolved beyond managing conflict within the community, to managing conflict external to the community as well.

The Upper Lands working group was also tasked with addressing the appropriate scale, scope and size of a future Cypress Village. The co-chair of the Upper Lands working group, Ashley Willard Bauman stated recently "Cypress Village has the potential to deliver something that doesn't exist in the Lower Mainland. It's a whole new way to live and experience the mountainside, one of the most exciting propositions."⁵⁷ Willard Bauman is a spokesperson for the Upper Lands working group. She does not represent BPP, nor is she elected to council. She is a volunteer, articulating a vision that is the culmination of a decade of consensus building in West Vancouver. She is part of a consensus building team that has continued through three working groups, two mayors and four councils. She represents the ever-increasing capacity of the general public in guiding political, business and community interests.

6.3 Leadership is everywhere

The Rodgers Creek working group showed that leadership in public policy flows from the public's interest in, and ownership of, public questions. Leadership is everywhere. Through the working group's ability to find solutions by including and giving voice to a wide of array of community interests, it found the unique voices of leaders throughout the community. Council encouraged the public to dig into the issues, without fear. In the Rodgers Creek example, the working group empowered interest groups, large and small, to take collective responsibility for building consensus, and for ensuring that sustainability – of the people, of the plan, and of the mountainside – was at the heart of community problem solving. The success of the process created a desire on the part of council and the community to continue in the same manner, for at

⁵⁷ Kerry Gold, "A quiet tide of change breaks on West Van," *The Globe and Mail*, March 14, 2015, S7.

least a decade. From the Rodgers Creek area development plan, to parks planning for West Vancouver as a whole, to the regional context statement for Metro Vancouver's regional growth strategy, the working group process was self-sustaining, creative and capable of tackling what might otherwise have been sensitive and polarizing questions for council. The legitimacy of council's formal policy decisions derived from the sanction of the working groups.

Multiple forces were driving change when the Rodgers Creek working group got underway: conflict at Eagleridge bluffs, uncertainty about future neighbourhoods in the Upper Lands, power imbalances among landowners, disenfranchised environmental and recreational interests, development pressures of BPP, outdated zoning designations and adversarial public processes. These interests had never been around a table together and these forces had never been embraced. All parties had a legitimate point of view, but there was no process to "allow...people to explore their interests with others whose world impacted their own but who saw the world differently."⁵⁸ In the words of Glenn Sigurdson, "you can keep on fighting if you want." However, in an age of cynicism about politics the working group model offers a way to deal with differences, in fulfillment of the public expectation that government can and should use good governance to build consensus. For the Upper Lands in West Vancouver, the working group process delivered public approval to council.

A consensus-based process heightens the level of engagement of participants and improves the quality of the relationship between all parties.⁵⁹ It extends leadership opportunity well beyond the authority structure. The method and the outcomes of many working groups reflected the ten guiding principles for consensus building that had been written twenty years earlier to promote sustainability. The working group model enabled public participation to shift from making representations to authority and hoping for the best, to being able to find trade-offs together. The process gave ownership to the individuals and groups who faced the challenge. It expected that participants would be guardians of the process and recognize that the process is the power. It expected that participants would lead. Beginning in 2006 and extending to today, across more than two-dozen public policy areas,⁶⁰ the working group model has placed the ownership of public questions in the hands of those who truly care, and who are most affected. It has enabled council to share its authority with professional staff, business and the general public. When

⁵⁸ *Vikings*, 261.

⁵⁹ Gerald Cormick, Norman Dale, Paul Edmond, S. Glenn Sigurdson, Barry D. Stuart, *Building consensus for a sustainable future – Putting principles into practice*, National Roundtable on the environment and economy, 1996, 11.

⁶⁰ See Appendix K for a complete list of working groups since 2006.

authority structures attract and support professional expertise and citizen engagement, legitimacy is enhanced.

7: LOOKING AHEAD

The Rodgers Creek working group process created a level playing field for parties who had experienced conflict between one another, who were unaccustomed to working together, and yet who shared a deep respect for the Upper Lands and the range of possibilities it offered. The approach and insights gained from the success of the Rodgers Creek working group could apply to the important task ahead of West Vancouver and the Squamish Nation, as the two communities address the future property development aspirations of the Squamish Nation, on and off-reserve.

7.1 Squamish Nation urban land development

The land is synonymous with life for the Squamish peoples, who have lived on the shores of the Salish Sea for thousands of years. The land sustains a culture and a spirituality that is a sacred trust for First Nations people. This study began with an historic conceit, which is that settlement began with the development of West Vancouver from the perspective of municipal government. Obviously, the Squamish Nation has inhabited the shores and mountains of the region for thousands of years. West Vancouver's early history unfolded entirely separately from the Squamish Nation peoples who, by then, were living on reserves. On Indian Reserve 5,⁶¹ the Indian Agent sold off parcels without Squamish Nation permission for utilities, infrastructure and other uses.⁶² The two communities have unfolded in parallel. There is scarcely any common experience. Working together when it comes to beliefs, biases, hopes and dreams for people and for the land, will be challenging. There is some common ground, if not a common approach.

As West Vancouver's history shows, the community mobilizes from time to time to save an area of old growth forest or an endangered bluff. The past decade in West Vancouver is testament to the passion the community has, for protecting its natural assets and for balancing the ecology and the economy of the community, wherever possible, and for mutual benefit. In many small and entirely non-controversial ways, the community demonstrates its passion for the natural world on a daily basis. Most people probably do not reflect very much on the Squamish Nation's

⁶¹ The Squamish Nation Reserve in West Vancouver is also referred to as Indian Reserve 5, or IR5. It is also referred to as the Capilano Reserve. IR5 is common usage in planning documents.

⁶² *Lions Gate*, D'Acre and Luxton, 142-3. Most of Chief Simon Baker's life, from 1942 – 1975, was dedicated to reclaiming pieces of Indian Reserve 5 (IR5) that had been sold without permission.

deep connection to the land throughout their territory, from the Seymour River to Whistler to the Sunshine Coast. Most are blind to the encumbrances on the Squamish Nation reserve of railway lines, a sewage treatment plant, water and sewer rights of way, or suspension bridge footings – the infrastructure needed to support the whole community and the local and national economy. Governments know that there are differences to reconcile and history to forgive, and so do the people they represent.

Today, the Squamish Nation is in the vanguard of innovation for First Nations finance and business development in Canada. The Nation has ambitious plans for real estate development, and has been a driving force in creating federal legislation to develop its reserve lands, in its way. The First Nations Commercial and Industrial Development Act (FNCIDA)⁶³ is federal legislation that enables economic development of reserve lands, from resources to real estate. The master plan for IR5 states that 40% of the reserve will be developed for market housing on the waterfront adjacent to West Vancouver. This represents significant real estate development potential, and massive change. In order to develop on IR5, Squamish Nation members must pass a companion piece of legislation known as the Land Code. In April 2011 the Squamish Nation membership defeated the Land Code by 808 – 547 votes. Real estate development of on-reserve land as the basis for cultivating a thriving Squamish Nation economy has not met with membership support, yet. For the non-Aboriginal community, development of IR5 land is a concern. The general public wonders when this might happen, what the scale of development will be, and how much the local population and traffic congestion will grow. Design issues and managing and coordinating infrastructure matters. Multiple stakeholders including the adjacent shopping centre, residents of local apartment towers, transportation authorities, municipal and regional government and the general public, will expect to be included in the planning.

The Squamish Nation is also actively acquiring fee simple lands, off reserve, including an unused parcel of former Fisheries and Oceans Canada property in West Vancouver.⁶⁴ It is

⁶³ The *First Nations commercial and industrial development act* (FNCIDA) became law April 1, 2006, in order to close a regulatory gap on reserves and allow complex commercial and industrial projects to proceed. In 2010 FNCIDA was amended by Bill C-24, the *First Nations certainty of land title act*. The amendments to FNCIDA allow on-reserve commercial real estate projects to benefit from greater certainty of title. The amendments will allow First Nations to request that their on-reserve commercial real estate projects benefit from a property rights regime, including a land title system and title assurance fund, identical to the provincial regime off the reserve. The certainty of land title is intended to increase investor confidence, and make the value of reserve lands comparable to similar properties off the reserve.

⁶⁴ The Department of National Defence property in Jericho and former RCMP headquarters on Heather Street are two recent acquisitions in Vancouver.

anticipated that the Squamish Nation will apply to rezone the land for market residential development, but that is unknown at this time. This is uncharted territory for West Vancouver, and raises questions about future Squamish Nation land acquisitions and land use plans, on and off reserve. In general, First Nations development in an urban environment is becoming increasingly popular for First Nations economic development. It is only a matter of time before municipal and First Nations land use planning will need to become a complementary endeavour.

First Nation's governance processes are consensus oriented. The guiding principles for sustainability, and West Vancouver's working group model, reflect traditional First Nations traditional beliefs: inclusive, equal, respect for all views, pragmatic, purpose driven. The working group model is well suited to First Nations decision-making, and offers a way to begin to understand and embrace differences, and to make decisions. As governments, West Vancouver and the Squamish Nation have participated together in many community projects and events, and in comprehensive service agreements. However, the two governments and two communities are not really accustomed to one another. Eventually both parties will be faced with creating new neighbourhoods on, and off, reserve lands.

7.2 Beyond jurisdictional rights

Working groups in West Vancouver have pushed the boundaries of decision-making in a good way, to include multiple interests and to incorporate all views without intimidation. Three working groups have been the focus of this study: Rodgers Creek, Parks and Upper Lands. They have been successful in achieving consensus. Working groups are the linchpin between the authority of council and the engagement of the community. They are an integrative form of governance, and were vital in moving West Vancouver toward sustainability in the Upper Lands. Governance, "as you peel back its layers (has) inclusion and voice....inevitably at the core,"⁶⁵ and this is what the Rodgers Creek working group was able to achieve.

Constitutionally, First Nations are an order of government. Municipal governments are not. Jurisdictional arguments of supremacy will be, and have been, won over and over by First Nations in Canada in the courts. It would be better to include the councils and communities of the Squamish Nation and West Vancouver together, from the beginning, and to listen to the many voices and move beyond jurisdictional acrimony.

⁶⁵ *Vikings*, 279.

West Vancouver reassessed, reimagined and redefined the established pattern of development in the Upper Lands, in spite of the fact that the land in question was privately owned, and zoned, for residential housing development. The Rodgers Creek working group process ensured that its recommendations would be implemented, because those who made the recommendations were the ones responsible for implementing them. This idea has profound implications for First Nations real estate development. Exercising the authority of the Squamish Nation and West Vancouver by empowering people through a working group, conducted openly, serves to motivate those with an interest in the outcome to share ideas, make trade-offs and accept the ideas of others whose views may differ from their own.

8: THE SHARED PATH

The Rodgers Creek working group is regarded as a model of consensus building. No doubt many citizens would rather have no development on the remaining forested slopes of West Vancouver. However, the Rodgers Creek plan built consensus in the community that led to the dedication of Whyte Lake park, and a future village where housing will be concentrated and social life can thrive. The working group process arose from a very contentious time in the community. The municipality and the general public discovered that the ecology of the mountain and the economic imperatives of private enterprise were not necessarily at odds. Local government stepped back from the authority it wields in council chambers and put good governance in place so that, through public engagement and consensus building, a better idea for the Upper Lands could emerge. British Pacific Properties learned that the best way to manage its private interest was to understand and work with the broad community, advancing the public interest at the same time.

Eventually, the Squamish Nation and West Vancouver will face the steep challenge of figuring out land uses together. As John Borrows observes in *Drawing Out Law*, “Participation too often occur(s) at a distance, through the legislatures, band council, media, or courts, with little active involvement from those whom their actions would most personally affect.”⁶⁶ Integrating the authority of the Squamish Nation and West Vancouver with the public participation of those most affected would be a good beginning. The working group model offers hope for a shared future that enhances opportunity, respects differences and assumes that we are both here to stay.

⁶⁶ Borrows, 12.

Appendices

Appendix A:
Rodgers Creek Area. Photograph taken from Jericho Point. 2008.



Rodgers Creek ADP Area

Appendix B:

District of West Vancouver Working Group Guidelines: Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group

1.0 Purpose

To envision a future community for the Rodgers Creek Area and establish detailed principles for the Area Development Plan, taking into consideration the Upper Lands principles and processes described in the Official Community Plan. Community facilities and potential land use patterns in adjacent lands may be part of the consideration.

2.0 Duties

The working group will assist staff in the development of a Rodgers Creek Area Plan by:

- reviewing the work done to date
- establishing detailed principles for the Area Development Plan
- providing direction on issues associated with implementation aspects of the Area Development Plan.

Once a draft Area Development Plan is prepared, the Group will review and provide advice on the draft plan. The advice of the Group will be forwarded to Council as part of a staff report.

3.0 Origins of Work/Project Background

The OCP provides policies to guide the development of the Upper Lands – objectives for the Upper Lands, four community building principles, a framework for identifying and acquiring public lands to meet long term community needs, and development strategies. It also provides that Area Development Plans be prepared “in order to establish future land use and development objectives for neighbourhoods and to create more detailed Development Permit guidelines for subsequent implementation and subdivision designs.” The scope of an Area Development Plan is set out in Policy UL6 (see OCP 2004, 107-08).

The four community building principles which are to guide all actions in the Upper Lands are:

1. create a strong community
2. establish a sensitivity and connection to the natural environment and mountain qualities
3. encourage a diverse community
4. focus on environmental and economic sustainability

The Upper Lands section of the OCP 2004 forms part of the Operating Guidelines.

4.0 Composition

- 4.1 Community Representation: 9 community members providing expert or specialist advice, or representative of a particular district-wide group with a major interest in the future of the Rodgers Creek Area: (1) from West Vancouver Streamkeepers, (1) leading edge developer, (1) Engineer with an understanding of mountainsides and sustainability, (2) individuals with an environmental background, (3) members with a background in Planning, Architecture and Landscape Architecture and an understanding of mountainsides and sustainability, (1) citizen interested in the future of the Rodgers Area.
- 4.2 Potential Conflict of Interest: Members should declare possible conflicts of interest to their working group Chairperson. The Chairperson will determine whether or not the member should be excused from participating in a discussion. (For reference, conflict of interest guidelines are in the Council Committee General Terms of Reference.)

4.3 Council Lead: Councillor Day

4.4 Staff Lead: Geri Boyle, Manager, Community Planning

5.0 Landowner Role

British Pacific Properties (BPP) is the principal land owner within the Rodgers Creek Area. There are three other landowners in the planning area: Roeck's with one 5 acre lot, the Wong holdings of three adjacent 5 acre lots and Mulgrave School. These landowners may be present at all meetings of the Working Group, unless the Group determines that they wish to meet In-Camera. It is anticipated that the landowners, or their consultants, will present information to the Working Group to increase the Working Group's understanding of: the attributes of the area, the opportunities and challenges that development of the area presents, and the development interests of the landowners. See also Section 9.0.

6.0 Term, Significant Milestones and Desired Outcome

Adoption by West Vancouver Council of an Area Plan for Rodgers Creek.

7.0 Meeting Schedule

The Working Group will meet throughout the planning program. Councillor Rod Day will Chair the Working Group. A meeting schedule and dates will be established at the first meeting based on the area planning program.

8.0 Decision Making Approach

The Working Group meetings will be productive sessions where issues are discussed and debated. The objective will be to reach consensus, but in the absence of consensus direction/advice of the Working Group will reflect the majority opinions of the Working Group.

9.0 Support/Professional Services Utilized

In addition to Planning staff, staff from Environment, Parks, Engineering and Community Services will be available to meet with the Working Group throughout the process. A considerable body of work has also been undertaken by BPP. Those consultants are available as well to act as resources to the group.

10.0 Approved Budget

A nominal budget is required for the Working Group to cover meeting room expenses, if necessary, and refreshment.

Appendix C: Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report Acknowledgements, 62.

The time and effort expended by the participants in this process has been considerable and is recognized below in their contribution in creating a community-based Area Development Plan, the District of West Vancouver's first.

Rodgers Creek Working Group led by Councillor Rod Day
John Barker, Harold Kalke, Dean Mailey, Frank Musson MAIBC, Jak Redenbach MAIBC, Julia Rylands, Brian Walker P. Eng, Michael Rose MCIP, Jennifer Bailey

District of West Vancouver Staff led by Geri Boyle MCIP, Manager of Community Planning
Corinne Ambor, Jim Bailey MCIP, Brent Dozzi P. Eng, Ray Fung P. Eng, Stephen Jenkins, Doug Leavers

Community Groups

West Vancouver Streamkeeper Society, North Shore Mountain Bike Association, Old Growth Conservancy Society, Members of local conservancy and hiking groups

Landowners within the ADP Area

British Pacific Properties Limited, P. Rock Limited represented by the Roeck family, Consortium represented by Edward Wong

Adjacent Landowners

Mulgrave Independent School Society

Consultants

Aqua-Tex Scientific Consulting Ltd., Burrow Huggins Architects, Calum Srigley Design Consultant Ltd., Chapman Land Surveying Ltd., Creekside Architects, Golder Associates, Holland Barrs Planning Group, InterCAD Services Ltd., iTrans Consulting Inc., Jorden Cook Associates, Maurice Pez Architect, Murdoch & Associates Architecture + Planning Ltd., Partington Real Estate Advisors Ltd., Philips Farevaag Smallenberg, Richard Henry Architect, Sartori Environmental Services, Seacor Environmental Inc., Webster Engineering Ltd.

Appendix D:
Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Technical Reports

1. Archaeological Impact Assessment, April 2008, Golder Associates Ltd.
2. Development Cost Levy, letter report July 7, 2008, Burgess Crawley Sullivan & Associates
3. Environmental Effects Report, March 2008, Sartori Environmental Services
4. Fiscal Impact Report, Executive Summary, March 2008, Sussex Consultants Ltd.
5. Rodgers Creek Tailed Frog Survey Summary, letter report April 10, 2008, SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd.
6. Sustainability Review and Evaluation, February 2008, Holland Barrs Planning Group Inc.
7. Traffic Impact Study, March 2008, iTrans Consulting Inc.

Appendix E: Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report, March 7. 2008, 4.

The Landscape Informs the Plan

The process of preparing the sieve analysis

A series of maps were prepared and carefully reviewed with District staff to provide an understanding of the land and its resources:

Topography, slope analysis and geotechnical conditions

Environmental resources, watercourses and setback lines

Watercourse assessment and proper functioning condition

Recreation and trail resources

Landscape and heritage resources

One completed the inventory and assessment maps were overlaid in a process referred to as a sieve analysis to reveal the complex interrelationships among many factors in the landscape with the intent that development in the area development plan area will fit with the land.

This method was pioneered by Ian McHarg in his book *Design with Nature*. Every site planner and designer learns this approach in school, but it is not often used as rigorously in practice, as it has with the Rodgers Creek Area Plan.

Appendix F: Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report, March 7 2008, District of West Vancouver, p 10.

Sieve Analysis Map

10

Sieve Analysis



Sieve Methodology

The sieve analysis has been a work in progress and has been refined a number of times. The original sieve analysis was prepared in collaboration with the land owners and District staff in an intensive workshop session.

Each watercourse was evaluated as a collaborative process at technical meetings, including detailed field review, and categorized with respect to its environmental values as H (high), M (moderate), or L (low).

Note: After the original Sieve Analysis was completed, the western boundary of the ADP Area above upper Cypress Bowl Road was expanded. The rationale for this expansion and the Sieve Analysis for this expanded area is included in Appendix A.

LEGEND

- PROTECTED SENIOR GOVERNMENT DETRACK AREA
- STEEPER SLOPES
- POTENTIAL GEOTECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS - FURTHER INVESTIGATION REQUIRED
- STEEP SLOPES - FURTHER INVESTIGATION REQUIRED
- MUNICIPAL SETBACK AREA - FURTHER INVESTIGATION REQUIRED
- DEVELOPMENT AREA
- LAND USE FEATURE TREE
- CRK TRAIL/ROAD (EXISTING)
- CRK SEQUOIA PATH (PROPOSED)

Appendix G:

West Vancouver Streamkeepers' Society principles

Reference: *Principles and Objectives for Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group regarding development within the Upper Lands.*

The principles are designed to achieve the following objectives:

- continued recruitment and migration of gravel within streams
- maintenance of natural flow patterns of streams
- maintenance of groundwater and ephemeral streams so as to replenish streams at a slow, consistent rate
- sustained respect for the land and its history

The following West Vancouver Streamkeeper principles seek to guide development of the Upper Lands such that:

1. Fish and fish habitat are preserved and protected.
 - resident cutthroat trout are prevalent in all of these streams
 - juvenile salmon, returning adult salmon, and sea-run cutthroat trout utilize the lower portions of most of these streams
 - streams that flow through the Upper Lands provide habitat for many animals including amphibians
 - aquatic invertebrates inhabit these streams and provide feed for fish and birds
2. Watercourses are protected from change of course, piping, unnatural erosion, and other human impacts.
3. Stormwater systems are designed to enhance watercourses.
4. Watercourses remain open and unimpeded.
 - bridges are used for road and pathway crossings
 - open bottom culverts are utilized
 - use of rip rap is minimized and set back from the wetted width
5. Stream health is maintained when impervious cover is minimized.
 - feeder roads from Chippendale Road and Cypress Bowl Road are built to reduced dimensions
 - consideration be given to constructing roadways without sidewalks and curbs
 - feeder roads, driveways, and parking areas are built of permeable material
6. Natural, undisturbed areas (open spaces) and green connectivity belts are maximized and planned into housing complexes, and horizontal connections are treated as importantly as vertical connections.
7. Native vegetation is retained.
 - forest topsoil removed from development sites is retained, replaced, and supplemented where necessary
 - landscape plans include re-vegetation using native species of trees and shrubs

- no invasive species are introduced
- re-vegetation is undertaken immediately

By using West Vancouver Streamkeepers' principles, the preservation of our fish, their habitat, and streams will be ensured. This is an opportunity for the Upper Lands to become an example of environmentally sensitive development.

Approved May 2, 2007 by WVSS Board of Directors.

Appendix H: Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report, March 7 2008, 12-13.

KEY ORGANIZING PRINCIPLES FOR THE RODGERS CREEK AREA PLAN

OCP Community Building Principle 1 for the Upper Lands – Establish a sensitivity and connection to the natural environment and mountain qualities:

- 1.01 Keep development outside of environmentally sensitive areas (i.e. riparian areas, steep slopes, geotechnical hazard lands) and protect significant natural features; place both environmentally sensitive areas and significant natural features in public ownership wherever possible (OCP Policy page 101 and 103)
- 1.02 Avoid fragmentation of environmentally sensitive lands by creating large, continuous forested / natural areas throughout the planning area (OCP Policy page 101)
- 1.03 Avoid wide-scale clearing intended solely to provide uninterrupted, panoramic views, and minimize tree clearing on single family lots
- 1.04 Employ site sensitive built forms by:
 - designing buildings to step into the terrain and using material and colours that harmonize with the forest setting; and
 - minimizing footprints and visual impacts (OCP Policy page 108)
- 1.05 Minimize the need for 'constructed' responses by providing for road layouts, design standards and alignments that are sympathetic to the terrain and minimize site disruption including clearing of entire road right-of-ways, as set out in the Roads Policy 1999
- 1.06 Watercourses remain open and unimpeded, and are protected from change of course, piping, unnatural erosion and other human impacts.*
- 1.07 Provide multi-use utility corridors to minimize impact on the landscape
- 1.08 Trails may be provided along creek corridors, when located so as to minimize the impacts on riparian areas (OCP Policy page 101)
- 1.09 Natural, undisturbed areas (open spaces) and green connectivity belts are maximized and planned into housing complexes, and horizontal connections are treated as importantly as vertical connections.*

OCP Community Building Principle 2 for the Upper Lands – Create a strong community

- 2.01 Concentrate higher densities in areas that will foster strong community interaction (including a proposed commercial centre located to the west of the planning area) and outside environmentally sensitive lands
- 2.02 Ensure that the concerns and impact of new development on existing development adjacent to the planning area are identified and considered
- 2.03 Provide a 'mountain pathway' defined as:
 - an east-west multi-use path, with gentle grades, for future residents of the planning area and the community at large; an
 - a path that provides a connection to the natural setting and a physical connection to each neighbourhood within the Rodgers Creek Planning Area, and to a future commercial centre and neighbourhoods to the west; and
 - a path that provides a variety of experiences and opportunities for people to meet, interact and connect (OCP Policy page 101)

- 2.04 Ensure that all destinations and public spaces including the mountain pathway (both its primary and secondary routes) provide for multiple activities by a variety of age groups and capabilities
- 2.05 Within the future Collingwood and Mulgrave Neighbourhoods, provide activity nodes along the mountain pathway that bring neighbours into regular social contact with each other. In the future development area at the west end of the Rodgers Creek Planning Area, provide community amenity buildings and facilities in addition to activity nodes along the mountain pathway.
- 2.06 Incorporate cultural heritage (such as logging and skilift history) and natural features (such as viewpoints, boulders and waterfalls) in activity nodes
- 2.07 Connect pedestrian and vehicle networks (including transit and cycling) into existing networks and with future amenities, including trails to and from the mountain
- 2.08 Include appropriate vehicle staging areas to ensure access to various public amenities and facilities
- 2.09 Provide for clear way-finding
- 2.10 Ensure all residential buildings are integrated into the landscape and have easy access to the mountain pathway
- 2.11 Continue the 1000-foot connector as the major east-west connecting road above the Upper Levels Highway (OCP Policy page 101)
- 2.12 Consider potential areas of synergy through the integration of Rodgers Creek Planning Area with future developments west of the Rodgers Creek Planning Area.
- 2.13 Identify existing recreational activities within and adjacent to the planning area and consider opportunities to retain, enhance and/or connect with these recreational activities.

OCP Community Building Principle 3 for the Upper Lands – Encourage a diverse community

- 3.01 Facilitate a diverse and more complete community by providing a variety of housing types and unit sizes
- 3.02 Provide opportunities for accessory housing such as coach houses, carriage houses and suites over garages and in the main dwelling, and do so by excluding them from total unit count

- 3.03 Ensure non-single family housing types include ground-oriented options such as duplexes, triplexes and townhouses
- 3.04 Ensure single family housing accounts for no more than 20% of the total housing units in the Rodgers Creek Planning Area (OCP Policy page 102: this policy provides for at least 40% non-single family homes in the entire Upper Lands; a higher percentage of non-single family is anticipated in the Rodgers Creek Planning Area)
- 3.05 Integrate housing with public/quasi public spaces and facilities, and connect with schools within the planning area and with the proposed commercial centre to the west

OCP Community Building Principle 4 for the Upper Lands – Focus on environmental and economic sustainability

- 4.01 Reduce the car-centric nature typical of new development with a focus on an effective movement system for pedestrian, cyclists and transit (OCP Policy page 101)
- 4.02 Green / sustainable design and operation standards, to a municipal standard that is being developed, form the foundation for building design
- 4.03 Strive for innovative, green infrastructure design and operation standards that minimizes immediate and life cycle cost
- 4.04 Think of rainwater as a resource, not a problem
- 4.05 Contribute to a resilient natural environment including healthy, properly functioning watercourses. Minimizing impervious surfaces and designing storm water systems to enhance watercourses are examples of measures that should be used to contribute to a resilient natural environment.*
- 4.06 Ensure that sustainability encompasses social sustainability, along with environmental and economic sustainability
- 4.07 Fish and fish habitat are conserved and protected*
- 4.08 Native vegetation is retained*

* From "Principles and objectives for Rodgers Creek Area Plan", adopted by West Vancouver Streamkeeper Society May 2, 2007.

Appendix I: Report to the Council of the District of West Vancouver, March 11, 2008.

Section 5.0 Conclusion. Key recommendations:

Recommendation 1: The working group commends the owners and District staff for adhering faithfully to the direction set out in the OCP.

Recommendation 2: The working group recommends that the District ensure timely delivery of the mountain path and trail network, along with installation of the many and diverse activity nodes along it.

Recommendation 3: The working group encourages the District and British Pacific Properties, as a major landowner in the future village area, to commence planning for the future village.

Recommendation 4: The working group is comfortable with retaining the option for Mulgrave School facilities, other than a full-sized sports field, to be located on all or part of the 5 acres to the immediate north of the existing school site, and recommends that the OCP area plan bylaw make provision for such an opportunity. Mulgrave School, once it acquires the property, would be required to obtain a rezoning and development permit to use the lands for school purposes. The working group further recommends that the District consider any school expansion proposal based on the following factors:

1. the extent to which the proposal reflects a sensitivity to the natural environment;
2. the impact of traffic on the adjacent residential neighbourhoods
3. the loss of small lot housing.

Recommendation 5: The working group strongly supports the Chippendale Road extension to upper Cypress Bowl Road, rather than to lower Cypress Bowl Road as shown in the OCP.

Recommendation 6: The working group strongly recommends Option B as it performs substantially better from a social, environmental and economic sustainability perspective.

Recommendation 7: The working group fully supports encouraging and enabling accessory housing (including by not counting an accessory unit as a housing unit for purposes of density calculation) as the plan performs substantially better from a social sustainability perspective.

Recommendation 8: The working group strongly supports all the sustainability initiatives set out in the overview report and emphasizes the importance of ensuring the delivery of the 'green' initiatives and of encouraging other initiatives over time as the plan area develops.

Recommendation 9: The working group fully supports the road standards proposed in the overview report and encourages ongoing diligence to ensure that implementation does not stray from the concepts set out in the overview report.

Appendix J:

Whyte Lake, in Whyte Lake Park

Whyte Lake Park is a dedicated 120 hectare park in an area previously designated as “Future Neighbourhood Area.” For comparison, Lighthouse Park is 75 hectares.



Appendix K:

Complete list of working groups 2006 – 2015

Working Groups (mandate completed)

1. Ambleside Town Centre Working Group (July 2007)
2. Arts and Culture Strategy Implementation Working Group (January 2008)
3. Child Care Services Working Group (December 2010)
4. Climate Action Working Group (March 2010)
5. Community Centre Governance Working Group (November 2007)
6. Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Working Group (Sept 2008)
7. Community Grants/North Shore Social Services Review Working Group (July 2008)
8. Community Sports Working Group (October 2008)
9. Community Website Development Working Group (July 2013)
10. Environmental Strategy Implementation Working Group (July 2008)
11. Field Sports Forum Working Group (September 2014)
12. Fiscal Sustainability Task Force (November 2006)
13. Fire & Rescue Services Review Working Group (April 2008)
14. Heritage Strategic Plan Implementation Working Group (October 2008)
15. Housing Pilot Program Working Group (May 2010)
16. Invasive Plant Working Group (June 2014)
17. Measuring Up Initiative Working Group (July 2009)
18. Parks Master Plan Working Group (June/July 2012)
19. Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group (April 2008)
20. Spirit Trail Working Group (July 2009)
21. Strategic Planning Working Group (January 2010)
22. Strategic Transportation Plan Working Group (April 2010)
23. Value for Services Working Group (December 2009)

Working Groups (current)

1. Community Energy and Emissions Plan Working Group (established November 2014)
2. Upper Lands Study Review Working Group (established December 2012)

Bibliography

- Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal (2008). *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borrows, John. (2010). *Drawing Out Law: A Spirit's Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Building Consensus for a Sustainable Future, Guiding Principles* (1993). An initiative undertaken by Canadian round tables.
- Cormick, Gerald and Norman Dale, Paul Edmond, S. Glenn Sigurdson, Barry D. Stuart, *Building Consensus for a Sustainable Future – Putting Principles into Practice* (1996). National Roundtable on the Environment and Economy.
- D'acres Lilia and Donald Luxton (1999). *Lions Gate*. Burnaby, BC: Talon Books.
- District of West Vancouver Council and Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group workshop (Oct 29, 2007). DVD recording.
- District of West Vancouver council minutes Council Advisory Committees and Community Engagement (Oct 16, 2006) M-6. File 0005-01/0115-01.
- District of West Vancouver council report: Proposed changes to district processes (Jan 16, 2006). File 0005-01.
- District of West Vancouver council report: Council Advisory Committees (July 5, 2006). File 0005-01.
- District of West Vancouver Official Community Plan (2004).
- District of West Vancouver Parks Master Plan (2012).
- District of West Vancouver Rodgers Creek Area Development Plan Overview Report (Mar 7, 2008).
- District of West Vancouver Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group Report to Council (Mar 11, 2008).
- District of West Vancouver Upper Lands Study Review working group draft report (Feb 2015).
- District of West Vancouver Working Group Guidelines, Rodgers Creek Area Plan Working Group (Mar 3, 2007).
- Envisioning Notebook: A vision for West Vancouver's Rodgers Creek & Cypress Village Communities, British Pacific Properties (Apr 2006).
- First Nations Commercial and Industrial Development Act (S.C. 2005 c. 53).
- Gold, Kerry. A quiet tide of change breaks on West Van. *The Globe and Mail*. (Mar 14, 2015) S7.

- Mansbridge, Francis. (2010). *Cottages to Community*. West Vancouver, BC: The West Vancouver Historical Society.
- Ramsey, Bruce. (1986). *A Place of Excellence*. District of West Vancouver.
- Rodgers Creek: A History and Summary of the Area Development Plan*. (2009). West Vancouver, BC: British Pacific Properties Limited.
- Rodgers Creek Fiscal Impact Report (Apr 2008). Sussex Consultants Ltd.
- Sigurdson, Glenn. Consensus Processes: Making Decisions and Resolving Conflict, A Passing Fancy or a New Order? An Essay on an Emerging Face of Governance.
- Sigurdson, Glenn. Module 2: Basic Concepts and Context. EMBA ABL, BUS 661.
- Sigurdson, Glenn. Module 3: Understanding and Creating Context: Establishing a Framework. EMBA ABL, BUS 661.
- Sigurdson, Glenn. (2014). *Vikings on a Prairie Ocean*. Winnipeg: Great Plains Publications.
- Standing Up for Nature, The Anatomy of a Protest, First draft* (2014). The Coalition to Save Eagleridge Bluffs.
- West Vancouver Streamkeepers' Society adopted principles and objectives for Rodgers Creek area plan working group regarding development within the Upper Lands. (May 2, 2007).